

REMARKS

In the Office Action of June 4, 2008, claims 1, 8, 12 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the enablement requirement with respect to the limitation of “*a predefined moment.*” Furthermore, claims 1-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 7,187,692 B1 (“Ooya et al.”).

In response, Applicants have amended claims 1, 8, 12 and 16 to overcome the section 112, first paragraph, rejections. In claims 1, 8, 12 and 16, the phrase “*a predefined moment*” has been replaced with the phrase “*a carrier signal end moment that coincides with the end of a transmission of a carrier signal from said communication station.*” Support for these claim amendments can be found at least on page 9, lines 9-11, of the current application with respect to “moment t4.” Thus, the section 112, first paragraph, rejections of claims 1, 8, 12 and 16 are now moot. As such, Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn.

With respect to the section 102 rejections of claims 1-23, Applicants have amended the independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference of Ooya et al. As amended, the independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16 now recite the limitations of “*wherein each of the transmission start moments results from a sum of a common selectable discrete time period and a number of waiting time periods from the predefined carrier signal end moment such that each of the transmission start moments coincides with the beginning of one of the waiting time periods,*” which are not disclosed in the cited reference of Ooya et al. Support for these claim amendments can be found at least in Fig. 2 and on page 9, lines 23-34, of the current application. Claims 5 and 21 have also been amended to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference of Ooya et al. Support for these claim amendments can be found at least in Fig. 2 and on page 9, lines 9-14, of the current application. As amended, Applicants respectfully assert that the independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16 are not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al., as explained below. In view of the amendments to

the claims and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the allowance of the amended independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16, as well as the dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17-23.

I. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 1, 8, 12 and 16

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites “*wherein each of the transmission start moments results from a sum of a common selectable discrete time period and a number of waiting time periods from the predefined carrier signal end moment such that each of the transmission start moments coincides with the beginning of one of the waiting time periods,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Ooya et al. Thus, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

The Office Action on page 4 has equated the claimed “*waiting time periods*” with the time slots described in the cited reference of Ooya et al. As illustrated in Fig. 3 and described in column 4, lines 44-58, the slave station B 302 begins transmitting a response signal after the beginning of the time slot 2 in the time delay period “2” within the time slot 2. Thus, the transmission starting moment for the slave station B does not coincide with the beginning of a time slot. Thus, the cited reference of Ooya et al. does not disclose “*wherein each of the transmission start moments results from a sum of a common selectable discrete time period and a number of waiting time periods from the predefined carrier signal end moment such that each of the transmission start moments coincides with the beginning of one of the waiting time periods,*” as recited in the amended independent claim 1. Therefore, the amended independent claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al. As such, Applicants respectfully request that the amended independent claim 1 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the amended independent claims 8, 12 and 16, which recite limitations similar to the limitations of the amended independent claim 1. Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the amended independent claims 8, 12 and 16 are also not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al., and request that the amended independent claims 8, 12 and 16 be allowed as well.

II. Patentability of Dependent Claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17-23

Each of the dependent claims 2-7, 9-11, 13-15 and 17-23 depends on one of the amended independent claims 1, 8, 12 and 16. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicants submit that these dependent claims are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. Furthermore, the dependent claims may be allowable for additional reasons.

As an example, the amended dependent claim 5 recites “*transmitting an inventory command from the communication station during the transmission of the carrier signal, the duration of the inventory command being shorter than the duration of the transmission of the carrier signal,*” which is not disclosed in the cited reference of Ooya. Thus, the dependent claim 5 is not anticipated by the cited reference of Ooya et al.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Breitfuss et al.

Date: September 4, 2008

By: /thomas h. ham/
Thomas H. Ham
Registration No. 43,654
Telephone: (925) 249-1300